

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 13 2006

**Withrow & Terranova**Professional Limited Liability CompanyAttorneys At Law  
Registered Patent Attorneys*A High Technology Patent Practice*

## FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET

TO:	FROM:
Examiner Quynh H. Nguyen	Steven N. Terranova
COMPANY:	DATE:
USPTO - Art Unit 2642	4/13/2006
FAX NUMBER:	TOTAL NO. OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER:
571-273-8300	3
PHONE NUMBER:	SENDER'S REFERENCE NUMBER:
	7000-432
RE:	YOUR REFERENCE NUMBER:
Interview Summary	09/745,525

☐ URGENT ☐ FOR REVIEW ☐ PLEASE COMMENT ☐ PLEASE REPLY ☐ ORIGINAL TO FOLLOW

## NOTES/COMMENTS:

Please find attached the following item(s):

- 1) Interview Summary (2 pages).

NOTE: The information contained in this transmission is privileged and confidential and intended ONLY for the individual or entity named above. If you should receive this transmission in error, please notify our office and return to the below address via the U.S. Postal Service.

201 SHANNON OAKS CIRCLE, SUITE 200

CARY, NC 27511

PH: (919) 654-4520

FAX: (919) 654-4521

**APR 13 2006**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of: Qingwen Hu et al.

Examiner: Nguyen, Quynh H.

Serial No. 09/745,525

Art Unit: 2614

Filed: 12/26/2000

For: **DYNAMIC ADAPTATION TO CONGESTION IN CONNECTION-ORIENTED NETWORKS**

Commissioner for Patents

PO Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

**INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

In response to the interview summary mailed April 7, 2006, Applicant offers a formal written reply. If any fees are required in association with this response, the Director is hereby authorized to charge them to Deposit Account 50-1732, and consider this a petition therefor.


SUMMARY

Applicant conducted interview with Examiner Nguyen on April 5, 2006. Applicant discussed as indicated in its response to the Final Office Action mailed on January 17, 2006, that the Kinnunen reference did not cure the deficiency in Ash sufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claims 1-10, 14-29, 32-37, and 39-42. Kinnunen states that a new connection can be rejected based on the bandwidth of the request. However, Kinnunen does not teach or suggest that a connection can be rejected based on whether the connection is voice or data. The same deficiency exists with respect to claims 11-13, 30, 31, 38, and 43-46. The Examiner agreed with Applicant's remarks that Kinnunen did not teach that a new connection can be rejected based on whether the connection is voice or data.

Respectfully submitted,

WITHROW & TERRANOVA, P.L.L.C.

By:

  
Steven N. Terranova  
Registration No. 43,185  
P.O. Box 1287  
Cary, NC 27512  
Telephone: (919) 654-4520

Date: April 13, 2006  
Attorney Docket: 7000-432

<p align="center"><u>CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION</u> I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS DOCUMENT IS BEING TRANSMITTED VIA FACSIMILE ON THE DATE INDICATED BELOW TO:</p> <p>Examiner: <u>Nguyen, Quynh H.</u> Art Unit: <u>2614</u> Fax: <u>571-273-8300</u></p> <p><u>Michelle Heymann</u> Name of Sender <u>Michelle Heymann</u> Signature <u>4-13-06</u> Date of Transmission</p>
---